

Appln No. 10/758,399
Amdt date February 9, 2007
Reply to Office action of November 17, 2006

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The above amendments and these remarks are in response to the Office action mailed on November 17, 2006. Claims 16, 19, 20, 23, 26, 27, 33, 34 and 36-39 have been amended. Claims 1-15, 21, 22, 28-32 and 47-58 have been cancelled. Claims 59-63 have been added and are directed to subject matter disclosed in the application as originally filed. No new matter has been added. Claims 16-20, 23-27, 33-46 and 59-63 are now pending in this application. Reconsideration on the basis of the above amendments and remarks below is kindly requested.

The Examiner allowed claims 40-44 and 46. Claim 45 had been withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. However, claim 45 is dependent from independent claim 40, which has been deemed to be allowable. As such, claim 45 should be re-entered, reconsidered and allowed as being dependent from a base claim that is allowed and for the additional limitations it contains therein.

The Examiner objected to claims 16-19, 23-25 and 33-36 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but stated that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of their base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 16, 19, 23, 33, 34 and 36 have each been rewritten in independent form including the limitations of their base claim and any intervening claims. As such, Applicants submit that claims 16, 19, 23, 33, 34 and 36 should now be in condition for allowance. Claims 17 and 18 are directly or indirectly dependent from claim 16. Claims 24-27 are directly or indirectly dependent from claim 23. Claim 35 is dependent from claim 34. Claims 37-39 are dependent from claim 36. As such, Applicants submit that claims 17, 18, 20, 24-27, 35 and 37-39 should also be in condition for allowance as being dependent from an allowable base claim and for the additional limitations they contain therein.

Claims 59-63 have been added and are rewrites of claims 22 and 29-32 respectively and to be dependent from claims 23, 33, 60, 33 and 33, respectively. Consequently, these claims should also be in condition for allowance as being dependent from an allowable base claim and for the additional limitations they contain therein.

Appln No. 10/758,399

Amdt date February 9, 2007

Reply to Office action of November 17, 2006

The rejections and objections to all claims pending in this application are believed to have been overcome and this application is now believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any remaining questions or concerns about the allowability of this application, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned attorney to discuss them.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP

By 

Constantine Marantidis
Reg. No. 39,759
626/795-9900

CM/scc

SCC PAS715544.1-*02/9/07 1:12 PM